REMARKS

In the Office Action dated March 21, 2007, claims 1 and 4-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yamamoto et al. Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. in view of Mastandrea, Jr. et. al.

These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons. The subject matter disclosed and claimed in the present application is a magnetic resonance apparatus that has a gradient coil unit and a patient bed mechanism that are both movable into and out of an examination space of the magnetic resonance scanner. For positioning the gradient coil unit relative to the examination space, it can be temporarily coupled with the patient bed mechanism, and the patient bed mechanism that moves the patient bed into the examination space, can simultaneously be used to co-move the gradient coil unit, together with the patient table, relative to the examination space. The temporary coupling of the gradient coil unit to the patient bed mechanism occurs automatically as the patient bed mechanism is moved into the examination space in a movement direction. The temporary coupling is released when the patient bed mechanism again moves in the same (said) movement direction, as explicitly stated in claim 1. In other words, no reversal of movement direction occurs in the subject matter of the present invention in order to release the coupling between the gradient coil unit and the patient bed mechanism.

Applicants acknowledge that the Yamamoto et al. reference discloses a magnetic resonance apparatus having a movable patient bed mechanism and a gradient coil unit that is also movable relative to the examination space. Applicants

do not find any disclosure in the Yamamoto et al. reference, however, as to how, or even if, coupling of any type occurs between the gradient coil unit and the patient bed mechanism.

In substantiating the anticipation rejection of claim 1 based on Yamamoto et al., the Examiner relied on Figures 19A and 19B, and the language at column 15, lines 36-51 in the Yamamoto et al. as, according to the Examiner, describing structure that operates as set forth in claim 1. Applicant does not agree that this portion of the Yamamoto et al. reference, or any other portion, provides such a disclosure.

In the passage of Yamamoto et al. cited by the Examiner, it is merely stated that the bobbin 16 is movable on rollers 92 that are accepted in grooves 94 in the inside wall 93 of the cylindrical space of the magnetic resonance apparatus. The passage by the Examiner refers to "the cylindrical space for loading the human body in the MRI apparatus," but this does not mean that the movement of the bobbin 16 is in any way related to "loading the human body in the MRI apparatus." The phrase "loading the human body in the MRI apparatus" merely serves as a phrase that defines "the cylindrical space" but does not refer to any specific function associated with loading the human body in the MRI apparatus, much less any function of the bed 213, which is not even shown in Figures 19A and 19B. The passage by the Examiner, therefore, merely describes that the bobbin 16 can be slid, via the rollers 92 in the grooves 94, along the longitudinal direction of the inner wall 93 of the cylinder of the magnetic resonance apparatus. As is clear from Figures 19A and 19B, this occurs completely independently of any movement of the bed 213.

When the patient bed is, in fact, intended to participate in some manner in movement of the bobbin 16, the bed is clearly shown, as indicated by reference character 111 in Figure 21. That embodiment is described in the paragraph beginning at the bottom of column 15, at line 64, which merely states that the bobbin 16 "is integrated with the bed 111." There are no details of how the integration of the bobbin with the bed occurs, but in the portion of that paragraph at the top of column 16, it is merely stated that the gradient coil is pushed, but as shown in Figure 22 it is apparently still coupled to the bed 111. Figures 21 and 22 merely indicate that the bobbin 16 moves together with the bed 111, but as is clear from those figures apparently there is no coupling and decoupling that takes place; the bobbin 16 *always* co-moves with the bed 111.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit the Yamamoto et al. reference does not disclose all of the elements of claim 1 as arranged and operating in that claim, and therefore does not anticipate claim 1, nor any of claims 4-7 depending therefrom.

The same arguments are applicable to the obviousness rejection of claims 2 and 3 based on Yamamoto et al. in view of Mastandrea, Jr. et. al. For the above reasons, even if the Examiner's statements regarding the teachings of Mastandrea, Jr. et. al. are correct, modifying the Yamamoto et al. structure in accordance with those teachings still would result in the subject matter of claims 2 or 3, both of which embody the subject matter of claim 1 therein, which is not disclosed in the Yamamoto et al. reference.

All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Submitted by,

Steven H. Noll (Reg. 28,982)

SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP
CUSTOMER NO. 26574
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312/258-5790
Attorneys for Applicants.

CH1\ 5049806.1